SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

13th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIII, Number 9 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 May 15, 1983

Keyworth Thriving as Reagan's Science Aide

If Ronald Reagan ever opts for the resurrection of horse cavalry and wooden men-of-war, it is a safe assumption that his Science Adviser, George A. Keyworth II, would suppress his incredulity and earnestly insist in public that the choices are technically sound and strategically necessary.

Persons unfamiliar with the history of the office held by Keyworth might look askance at such a performance. But the advisory role, though often glorified in fiction, ranks relatively low in the White House hierarchy, and ever since it was created, as part of Dwight Eisenhower's soothing response to Sputnik, its successful occupants have publicly performed as supreme

Geological Survey Hard Hit By Budget, Policy Shifts—Page 3

presidential loyalists. Those few who felt that a professional scientific background warranted some measure of political autonomy quickly found themselves isolated and ignored. Their experience is central to the folklore of presidential science advising, and apparently was well impressed upon Keyworth when he took up the post in April 1981. Several months later, he told an interviewer, "My number one job is being sensitive to the President's philosophy."

Keyworth is neither isolated nor ignored, and, in fact, by the hazy measures of performance that have developed around the job, it can fairly be argued that he is at least as effective as any of his precedessors. Support of basic research in the "hard sciences," which is an ancient constituent of Keyworth's shop—the Office of Science and Technology Policy—is being tenderly looked after by the Reagan Administration after a few zig-zags back in 1981. And, to the astonishment of many oldtimers inWashington science-policy circles, the Reagan Administration has been crimping the funds of the old, expensive, and heretofore politically untouchable national labs.

This performance has drawn ecstatic praise from Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences, who experienced the politics of science as Jimmy Carter's science adviser. Though Press has serious reservations about other aspects of Reagan and research [see page 4] last July he told a Washington audience that Keyworth "seems to have the courage to tackle these very difficult and politically dangerous issues of evaluation and reorganization and reallocation in order to put money into the best scientific institutions, the best people in the country.

"I think we should give him credit for this," Press added. "None of his predecessors were able to accomplish this, but in principle it can lead to the strongest program imaginable."

A search for the ingredients of this much-praised performance must focus on three elements:

Keyworth, a physicist who spent his career at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, was from outside the predominantly academic "club" from which past science advisers were recruited;

The nation's economic distress has inspired a desperate search for remedies, among which the alleged wonders of science and technology inevitably rank high in the hopes and public relations of the Reagan Administration, and

While Keyworth reaps the credit for Administration actions favorable to science, technology, and academe, official Washington regards him as quite a decent fellow and tends to absolve him of responsibility for the Ad-

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

NIH reports a new peak last year in that hapless category of grant applications deemed worthy of support for which there wasn't enough money. According to a just-completed analysis, "The proportion of unfunded competing research project applications eligible for award...reached 63 percent in FY 1982." For four of the past six years, the unfunded rate topped 50 percent. In 1974, it was 29 percent.

With the East-West political chill denying them the participation they once shared in the US deep-sea drilling program, the Soviets have contracted with a Finnish yard for construction of an advanced drilling vessel, according to American oceanographers.

In an update of its 1979 report on *Technology and East-West Trade*, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment expresses skepticism about US ability to use trade as a weapon against the Soviets. Referring to embargos on grain and energy equipment, OTA says the results were "inconclusive at best." On technologies of military value, it concludes that "it is rare to find technologies obtained from the West [openly or illicitly] which the USSR could not have produced itself, albeit with delays."

...Reaping the Credit, Dodging the Blame

(Continued from page 1)

ministration's mindless savaging of the social sciences and the budgetary suffocation that is developing at the National Institutes of Health.

Examining these factors together, one finds that Keyworth, contrary to expectations, has benefited greatly from coming to Washington, at age 41, with no prior experience in the curious backscratching culture that had developed between the presidential Science Office and the many hungry claimants for federal research support. Unlike his predecessors, he was not a member of the National Academy of Sciences, an institution which has long specialized in the production of grand rationales for more money and fewer strings.

In fact, coming in as part of an Administration that had declared a holy war on the federal role in domestic affairs, Keyworth could, and did, freely sound off with long overdue questions about quality control in American science. He galled many of the oldtimers by repeatedly asserting that the system had developed a tolerance for "mediocrity," and that short rations for a time would have a therapeutic effect. He demanded that the warlords of high-energy physics recognize that they can't have it all, and must settle on a building program designed for scientific advance rather than career security. And he even initiated some stirrings in the archaic realm of agricultural research, though the politics there are in a heavyweight league that may not have to fear too much from such smallfry as the presidential Science Adviser.

How much of what is happening in R&D policy would have happened anyway as a consequence of the Administration's economic and defense policies? The answer is that Keyworth is riding with strong tides but has also influenced the course.

For example, his criticisms of the high-energy physics leadership have been accompanied by his support for major budget increases to finance construction and operation of pioneering facilities. After a survey verified the near-distintegration of federal support for mathematics, he successfully pushed for increased math funding by NSF and the Defense Department. NSF has new funds this year for a program designed to keep young faculty members from going off to industrial jobs. [see page 5]. And though he has stirred outrage in the materials-sciences community and opposition in Congress, Keyworth got funds in next year's budget for a massive materials science center at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

Interestingly, while Keyworth is widely credited, by Frank Press and others, for budgetary gains in federal R&D accounts, he has drawn virtually no fire for the many budgetary losses that have occurred—though he gives not an inch in defending the Administration in Congressional hearings and other public forums. The same goes for the gross imbalance that the Reagan Administration has created in favor of defense R&D spending. Though many abhor it, and Keyworth defends it, it is considered to be the work of other hands.

How does Keyworth rank with the President and the inner circle of the White House? They seem to think there is a political advantage in deploying the President's Science Adviser in behalf of politically controversial issues. Thus, he's been assigned to brief the press on MX and high-tech missile defense, though he has not played any central advisory role on either issue.

Perhaps the most significant measure of the relationship between the Science Adviser and the President's political entourage is to be found in the sensitive issue of staff—a standard index of status in the presidential pecking order. Under Keyworth, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy has blossomed into one of the largest staffs in the Executive Office bureaucracy. Down to a skimpy dozen or so in the frugal Carter Administration, it has since grown to about three times that number.

Novices in the craft of science-adviser watching foolishly focus on the question of how often does the adviser see the President, alone and in groups. Not often, is usually the case, and so it is with Reagan and Keyworth. A better measure is how many troops are assigned to the adviser. By that standard, George Keyworth ranks high.—DSG

ISSN 0048-9581

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1983

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Margaret E. Lee

Contributing Correspondents
Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, $132.50 (two years, $235.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

Geological Survey: Oldline Agency in Hard Times

While the big-budget research agencies with academic clients easily stir up sympathetic public attention when political tides go against them, some of the small, oldline agencies have been suffering out of sight.

Prominent among them is the venerable US Geological Survey, which Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences, described in his recent annual report to the members as "gradually losing its historic position as a world leader in research" [see page 4]. That assessment draws no dissent from candid insiders, though, as Press noted, the Survey's troubles pre-date the Reagan Administration.

The Survey's traditional status as an agency apart from politics was trampled at the outset of the Carter Administration when Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus unceremoniously ousted Survey Director Vincent McKelvey, thus breaking the century-old custom of the directors staying on while presidents come and go. Brought in to replace him was William Menard, of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, but when the Reagan Administration came in, it did nothing to revive the tradition of a-politicality. Out went Menard, to be replaced by Dallas Peck, a career scientist at the Survey.

The appointment had several merits from the perspective of the tradition-bound Survey, for Interior Secretary James Watt did abide by the ancient custom of picking the Director from a list of nominees submitted by the National Academy of Sciences. Furthermore, Peck was a Survey man.

But, apart from attending to such personnel niceties, which have more symbolic than operational significance, the Administration has not been at all kind to the Survey.

In the last year of the Carter Administration, the Survey was budgeted for $481 million in direct appropriations, an increase of nearly $30 million from the previous year. Since Reagan took office, the budget has persistently declined. This year it is $401 million. The request for fiscal 1984 is $359 million. But perhaps even more important than money, the Survey's historic role as the trustworthy cataloger of the nation's natural resources was considerably reduced when Watt decreed a reorganization that took the Conservation Division out of the Survey and assigned it to a new Minerals Management Service.

The proposed financial cuts for next year are spread among many programs within the organization. Thus, $10 million would be cut from the $77 million now budgeted for national mapping, geography and surveys; $22.5 million would be cut from the present $141-million program of mineral-resource surveys and mapping, including an $11-million reduction in geologic-hazards surveys. And, here and there throughout the Survey, other cuts are proposed, too, along with a few increases.

The savaging of the Survey's budget was not well received by the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Interior when the Survey's annual review began on April 22. Confronting Rupert Southard, Chief of the National Mapping Division, with the budgetmakers' plans to trim spending by reducing the number of colors and name places on some Survey maps, Chairman Sidney Yates (D-Ill.) caustically asked whether the Chief approved. Southard conceded that "it is not a better map."

Yates demanded of the Director, "Why are you insisting on cutting us back, Mr. Peck?"

Peck replied, "The entire budget was put together under a severe constraint."

Addressing Robert Hamilton, Chief Geologist, Yates referred to the earthquake hazards of the Pacific Coast

(Continued on page 4)

...Troubled But Not Sick

"The Survey is going through a troubled transition, but it is not a sick organization."

That's the impression of one of the participants in an ongoing examination of the Survey that the National Academy of Sciences commenced in January. Commissioned by the Survey, but independent of it, the study is being carried out by a 13-member Committee Advisory to the USGS. The group, mainly drawn from academe and industry, is chaired by M. Gordon Wolman, Chairman of Geography and Environmental Engineering at Johns Hopkins.

The study format calls for meeting for a couple of days approximately every few months to examine major programs of the Survey, after which a report is sent to Director Dallas Peck. Two meetings have been held so far, in January and April, with the draft report from the latter meeting now circulating among the members. The next session is tentatively scheduled for next fall.

After the January meeting, the Committee sent Peck a report that generally outlined its plan of study and sense of priorities for the Survey. Among the areas singled out for attention were marine geology, scientific directions for the Survey, geological hazards, and resource assessment.

In a "framework for committee discussion," it was stated that "in all its studies this committee would keep in mind (1) What can the Survey do that no one else can? (2) What should the Survey do and why? (3) How should the Survey relate to industry, the states, and academia?"

Academy President Assails Reagan R&D Policies

Deadline limitations prevented more than a brief account in SGR of May 1 of the annual report that National Academy of Sciences President Frank Press delivered to the NAS members April 26. The address, however, merits attention as the first extensive indictment of the Reagan Administration's science policy to be offered by an establishment figure—and perhaps even more attention for coming from the customarily cautious Academy President. Of particular interest are his references to the Administration's weakening of several major R&D agencies, the imposition of political loyalty tests for science advisers, and the need for reevaluating restrictions on Soviet-American science ties. Following are excerpts:

●

...despite the generally positive [budget] picture, there are some disappointments. Support for the social sciences is only slowly recovering from the large cuts of the last two years. The research activities of the Environmental Protection Agency continue to be devastated at a time when more, not less science, is needed for regulatory decision making. The Bureau of Standards is being damaged by this Administration, as it has been by previous Administrations. The US Geological Survey is gradually losing its historic position as a world leader in research. Efforts to upgrade...agricultural research through the use of competitive peer-reviewed grants are being stymied by a recalcitrant and heavily lobbied Agricultural Subcommittee.

It is worrisome that appointments to high-level positions with responsibility for the management and conduct of major scientific programs, and appointments to scientific advisory committees, are being made conditional on political loyalty. It must be said that each Administration initially assumes that all Presidential appointments should go to party loyalists. But usually, after a few months, appointing officials learn that certain positions call for...the highest professional and scientific qualifications and should not require a test for political loyalty. It is disappointing that in the mature days of the present Administration, some agencies still require such tests. I [and others] have met some limited success in getting the message across, but the matter is still a source of concern and must be followed closely.

The powerful impact of science and technology...has led many officials in this and preceding Administrations to propose restrictions on disseminating research results in several key fields, even though the work is unclassified. The justification is national security, economic protectionism, or political response to actions of another country. One need only examine the experience of scientific progress in closed societies to understand that greatness in science goes hand in hand with freedom of communication...

The Soviet Government invests enormous sums in science. In a number of fields, Soviet science is at the very forefront of knowledge. These are important, perhaps compelling, reasons to maintain scientific contact with Soviet scientists, especially in those fields where we have something to learn and where it is important to understand the level of effort and progress of Soviet research efforts.

However, scientific contacts with the Soviet Union are withering for several reasons: The concern of our own government to restrict...contacts as a means of punishing the Soviets for their international actions...and the abhorrence on our part to the abrogation of human rights of scientists in the Soviet Union...

There seems to be a significant degree of sentiment on the part of [Academy members] that the current moratorium represents an unsatisfactory state of affairs. It seems to have been ineffective in pressuring the Soviet government on the human rights issue and it has deprived many American scientists and deserving Soviet scientists of the benefits of mutual contacts.

Our members want the officers to continue discussions with the Soviet Academy, with the hope of arriving at a different arrangement in which scientific cooperation can take place on the basis of participants selected by invitation or by prior negotiation. But our members feel strongly about the human rights issue and insist that any agreement must be modulated by Soviet progress in the human rights area.

[In regard to members' concerns about "nuclear war and the lack of progress in arms control" current NAS activities include] a newly initiated National Research

(Continued on page 5)

SURVEY

(Continued from page 3)

and said, "We've been telling you to beef up [the research], haven't we?"

Hamilton agreed, and Yates added that the proposed cuts are "kind of surprising, because I would have thought the President, of all people, would want to protect California."

Hamilton: I would have thought so, too.

While there's no telling what budget changes might come out of the topsy-turvy situation that prevails in Congress, the recent California earthquake was one of those politically propitious events that can turn the tide, even in a difficult budget season. Chairman Yates said on several occasions that this is no time for cutting the Survey's budget.

NSF Offers Statistical Profiles of Universities

One of the more illuminating but apparently lesser-known items in the National Science Foundation's cornucopia of statistical services is a series of "Institutional Profiles" detailing money, manpower, programs, and much else at just about every master's- and PhD-granting institution in the country—about 600 in all.

Concise (10 pages for each school) and free of charge, the profiles are compiled from NSF's systematic surveys of academe, plus data that the Foundation collects from other federal agencies that support education and academic research. NSF has been collecting this information for 30 years, but it was only three years ago that the various entries were combined in one package.

Items covered in a profile include an institution's discipline-by-discipline R&D spending from 1975 through 1981 (latest year in the series); federal, local and other sources of R&D finance; capital expenditures; the federal agencies providing R&D funds; full- and part-time student enrollments and faculty and postdoc employment.

NSF says that in addition to providing each institution with a copy of its own profile, it also sends out about 200 a year in response to requests. Most of these go to researchers and administrators who apparently want to keep tabs on what's happening elsewhere, NSF says.

The profiles, for individual institutions or batches of them, are available from Richard J. Bennof, Division of Science Resources Studies, NSF, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550, Room L-602; tel. 202/634-4673.

PRESS

(Continued from page 4)

Council study on the environmental consequences of a nuclear exchange...; the possibility of a study of the health effects of nuclear war...; the preparation of a series of ten reports or booklets dealing with critical arms control issues to be used with Congress and for publication, to be issue this year...

[In regard to] the President's proposal for a high-technology approach to defense against nuclear attack...we should see [as an institution and as individuals] if an appropriate role presents itself for us to make a contribution as the debate unfolds. It seems to me that, as in all its activities, the NAS must offer deliberative, credible, expert, nonpolitical advice on defense-related matters as an institution, but that its members are free to take personal political positions on all sides of the issue.

New Grants Program Starts

The National Science Foundation is accepting nominations for the first batch of Presidential Young Investigator Awards, a program of longterm, plump research grants designed to keep talented science and engineering faculty from switching to industrial jobs.

Proudly unveiled in January by George A. Keyworth, the President's Science Adviser, as a tailored response to academe's manpower problems, the program represents something of a departure in federal support of university-based research. But it's relatively small, providing for a maximum of only 200 grants per year.

The winners, to be nominated by their institutions and selected by outside reviewers appointed by NSF, will receive research grants that can run up to five years and provide a minimum of $25,000 a year and as much as $100,000. The latter figure would result from a formula under which NSF would match dollar for dollar industrial contributions up to $37,500 per grantee. Salaries must be provided by the institution.

Participation in the program is limited to tenured or tenure-track faculty members in mathematics, physics, the biological sciences, and engineering who received their doctorates after September 1, 1976. Why just those fields? Because, in the Administration's view, of their close relevance to industrial rejuvenation and national security.

The deadline for nominations for the first awards is July 1, and the money is scheduled to start flowing in February 1984.

For further information: Michael M. Frodyma, Director for Postdoctoral Programs, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-7536.

AAU Issues Fraud Guide

The Association of American Universities has added to the growing pile of recommended guidelines for coping with fraudulent research, and, like those previously issued by the National Institutes of Health and the Association of American Medical Colleges, the AAU's *Report of the Committee on the Integrity of Research* calls for locating the guardian role on the home campus. The report stresses that lab chiefs should be considered responsible for the performance of subordinates and that institutions should work out procedures for dealing with suspicious events. For copies: AAU, One DuPont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

Science Attaches: Who's Who in Washington

Following SGR's March 15 listing of the science attaches and other research-related officials at US embassies abroad, below are their foreign counterparts in Washington. Members of both groups can be helpful in obtaining information about research and related activities abroad, though that varies from embassy to embassy. To complete the address, fill in Embassy of _____, Washington, D.C.; telephone area code for all is 202; all are males, unless otherwise noted.

●

Australia	Desmond Barnsley, Counselor; Ronald Cummins, Attache (both Defense Science); 1601 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20036; 797-3000.
Belgium	Luc Arnould, Scientific Counselor, 3330 Garfield St. Nw., 20008; 333-6900.
Bulgaria	Krassimir Todorov, Second Secretary, Science and Technology; 1621 22nd St. Nw., 20008; 387-7969.
Canada	George Rehjon, Counselor, Environment; John Harrison, Counselor, Science and Technology; George A. Reincke, First Secretary, Energy; Charles E. Hubley, Counselor; James R. Brown, Attache (both Defense R&D); 1746 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20036; 785-1400.
China	Wu Yikang, Counselor, Science and Technology; Wang Defu, Shen Jinpu, Quian Hao (all Second Secretary); Mrs. Peng Feifei, Li Shubao (both Third Secretary); Huang King, Attache; 2300 Connecticut Ave. Nw., 20008; 382-2500.
Commission of European Communities	Francois Lafontaine, Counselor, Science and Technology; Christian Cleutinx, Energy; Joseph Marchal, Nuclear Supply; Suite 707, 2100 M St. Nw., 20037; 862-9575.
Czechoslovakia	Miroslav Jelinek, Head, Scientific Section; 3900 Linnean Ave. Nw., 20008; 363-6315.
Finland	Raimo Mansukoski, Counselor, Science and Technology; 2133 Wisconsin Ave. Nw., 20007; 363-2430.
France	Jacques Bodelle, Science Counselor; Jean-Pierre Fouquet, Jean-Claude Pinon, Jean-Louis Hyacinthe, Michel Robin, Jean-Pierre Letouzey, Mrs. Catherine Soulard, Mrs. Alain Jubier, Miss Anne Viret (all Scientific Attache); 2011 Eye St. Nw., 20036; 659-3550; Bertrand Barre, Atomic Energy Attache, 1920 N St. Nw., Suite 610; 785-1833 (French science attaches are also based in New York, Boston, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.)
German Democratic Republic	Konrad Grote, Scientific Counselor; Klaus Hesse, Second Secretary; Hartmut Vosswinkel, Third Secretary; 1717 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20036; 232-3134.
German Federal Republic	Dietmar Frenzel, Jorn Brand (both Counselor, Science and Technology); Detlef Boldt, Christoph Ruedel (both First Secretary, Science and Technology); Hans Trauman, Attache, Science and Technology; 4645 Reservoir Rd. Nw., 20007; 298-4328
Great Britain	Anthony Cox, Counselor, Science and Technology; R.S. Baxter, First Secretary, Technology; Michael G. Norton, First Secretary, Science; John Gaunt, Attache, Atomic Energy; 3100 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 462-1340 x2249.
Hungary	Istvan Szemenyei, Second Secretary, Scientific; 3910 Shoemaker St. Nw., 20008; 362-6730.
India	R.D. Deshpande, Counselor, Science; T.S. Nayar, Attache (Science); 2107 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 265-5050.
Israel	Naaman Belkind, Scientific Counselor; 3514 International Dr. Nw., 20008; 364-5652.
Italy	Giorgio Rinelli, Scientific Attache; 1601 Fuller St. Nw., 20009; 328-5500.
Japan	Hiroto Ishida, Scientific Counselor; Tetsuhisa Shirakawa, First Secretary, Scientific; 2520 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 234-2266, ext. 205.
Korea	Shiyohl Park, Scientific Attache; 2320 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 483-7383.
Mexico	Alfred Ramierz-Araiza, Scientific Counselor; 1101 15th St. Nw., Suite 205, 20005; 659-0523.
Netherlands	Henk J. de Hullu, Assistant Scientific Attache; Peter Lablans, Second Secretary, Scientific; 4200 Linnean Ave. Nw., 20008; 244-5300.
Pakistan	Tariq Mustafa, Minister, Technical; 2315 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 332-8330.
Poland	Jan Brukszo, Scientific Counselor; 2460 16th St. Nw., 20009; 234-3800.
Romania	Gheorghe Ungureanu, Second Secretary; 1607 23d St. Nw., 20008; 232-4747.
South Africa	Cyril Hide, Scientific Counselor; 2555 M St. Nw., 20037; 362-8805.
Sweden	Nils Starfelt, Scientific Counselor; 600 New Hampshire Ave. Nw., 20037; 298-3500.
Switzerland	Christian Risch, Scientific Counselor; 2900 Cathedral Ave. Nw., 20008; 745-7900.
Tunisia	Mahmoud Triki, Counselor, Scientific and University Affairs; 2408 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 234-6444.
USSR	Yevgeniy Zhvakin, Attache, Science and Technology; 1125 16th St. Nw., 20036; 628-7554.
Venezuela	Rogelio Valladares, Scientific Counselor; 2445 Mass. Ave. Nw., 20008; 797-3800.
Yugoslavia	Vladimir Petkovski, Scientific Counselor; 2410 California St. Nw., 20008; 462-6566.

Government-University Forum Being Established

Establishment of a Forum on Government-University Relations—an ongoing mechanism for talking over joint problems—has been recommended by a panel of the National Academy of Sciences, and the NAS has taken steps to establish the forum as an independent body. The White House Science Office has indicated interest in the Forum, but what that means is unclear, along with many other aspects of this addition to the existing clutter of meeting points for government and academe.

The proposal for the Forum originated with the now-defunct National Commission on Research—a Carter era university-based examiner of federal-university frictions—and was revived and endorsed by the Academy's Committee on Government-University Relationships in Support of Science. Chaired by Burke Marshall, of Yale Law School, the 25-member Committee plodded along for over 18 months before issuing its report, *Strengthening the Government-University Partnership in Science* [234 pages, $14.95, National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418].

The recommendation for the Forum is perhaps most noteworthy for the Committee's many disavowals of what the Forum is not. "The Forum," it states, "will not be a device for one-sided advocacy." It will be governed by a seven-member "core group" appointed by the NAS President with the approval of the NAS Council, but "The members of the core group are not the Forum; they are the conveners and will bring into the Forum individuals on all sides of any given question who are directly concerned with the issues." The core members will, of course, be "chosen for breadth, distinction, and credibility," but "The Forum is not to be thought of as an elitist super board of strategy, a kind of ultimate policy council, or a Supreme Court." It is to be an "arena for dialog, for statesmanship."

In the democratic tradition, its sessions will "normally be open to the public. But the Forum will also hold off-the-record sessions to permit various constituencies to give preliminary expression to grievances without the constraints of public discussion."

In Print

Government and Microelectronics: The European Experience, by Dirk de Vos, report of a study commissioned by the Science Council of Canada, reviews policies and practices in Britain, France, West Germany, Sweden, The Netherlands, and the EEC. De Vos, an international lawyer and business executive, concludes that "European governments have been sinking immense amounts of public resources into the maintenance of industrial competitiveness, increasingly equated with technological excellence...But above all...concern has been manifested by a ceaseless and energetic pursuit of alternative, better ways of mobilizing national resources and meeting competitive threats." (102 pages, Catalog No. SS21-1/49E, $5.40 outside Canada, from Canadian Government Publishing Center, Supply and Services Canada, Hull, Quebec, Canada K1A OS9).

From the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment: *Assessment Activities,* 42 pages, lists OTA work in progress and in press, recent publications and publications of special interest; *List of Publications,* 38 pages, latest update of the full OTA bibliography. (Both available without charge from US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20510; tel. 202/224-8996.)

US-PRC Science Meeting

George A. Keyworth, the White House Science Adviser, is heading a 25-member delegation that left for Beijing May 6 for about 10 days for the annual meeting of the US-People's Republic of China Joint Science and Technology Commission.

Members of the US contingent include the directors of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, the President of the National Academy of Sciences and the incoming President of the Academy of Engineering, plus officials from the Office of Management and Budget and the National Security Council and other government ressearch agencies. The Commission is the supervisory body for 17 separate agreements governing research and educational collaboration between the two countries.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $132.50 ☐; two years, $235.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Defense Gets Larger Role in Social Sciences

Federal support for social and behavioral sciences research has dropped sharply over the past four years, while a bigger portion of spending in those fields has been shifted to research in psychology supported by the Department of Defense, according to an unpublished report by the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Prepared at the request of the House Science and Technology Committee, the report states that total federal spending for social and behavioral reserch dropped from $523.8 million in fiscal 1980 to $397.7 million at present. During that period, however, the Defense Department's support of psychology increased from $63.5 million to $105 million. At the same time, the National Science Foundation's psychology program dropped from $13.4 to $8.6 million.

CRS, which is part of the non-partisan Library of Congress, is necessarily cautious in dealing with the right-wing loony politics that inspired these slashes, but since that subject cannot be totally ignored, the author, Genevieve J. Knezo, matter-of-factly states:

"Because the cuts...were disproportionately larger than the cuts for other areas of science, except for the cuts in science education, some observers have charged that the...cuts were ideologically motivated, that is, the administration views social scientists as liberal social reformers or biased advocates of social change."

While the Administration has been attempting to create an impression of a touch more sympathy for the social and behavioral sciences in the budget for the coming year, the CRS report points out that even with the increases, the civilian agencies will still be below their 1980 levels.

Summarizing some of the policy issues that might merit Congressional attention, the CRS study asks, "Is the knowledge and understanding generated by behavioral and social science research less economically productive than the knowledge produced by hard sciences and therefore of lower priority than federal funding for other kinds of research?"

The policy summary also notes that the Consortium of Social Science Associations has reported a decline in applications for social and behavioral research grants. And CRS asks whether that might "mean that some...research has been poor quality all along, and that the unacceptable marginal excess is what is now being eliminated...?"

When being grilled in Congressional witness chairs, Administration officials have politely justified the financial mistreatment of the social sciences on the grounds that the so-called hard sciences must come first for purposes of economic revival and national security. But in private conversations some of them frankly express dismay about the quality of a lot of federally supported research in these fields, and they insist that a good dose of hard times might be beneficial.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

9999
Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106